

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/031,046	01/11/2002		John Addink	100302.0016US1	8668	
34284	7590	12/07/2004		EXAMINER		
ROBERT D		ΙD	RODRIGUEZ, PAUL L			
611 ANTON			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
COSTA ME	SA, CA	92626-1931	2125			

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			7					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisor, Action	10/031,046	ADDINK ET AL.						
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Paul L Rodriguez	2125						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.								
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	-		takan satu takan da					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF								
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:								
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);								
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.								
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.								
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).								
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NO	T place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,7,8,10-17,19 and 21-26</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)								
10. Other:		2/1/	Zi					

Paul L Rodriguez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2125

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant has rolled the limitations of claims 27 and 28 into independent claims 1 and 10 arguing that Collins and the combination of Collins and Peek et al fail to teach the claimed invention. In the previous office action the Examiner relied upon Collins to teach an irrigation system (figure 1) comprising each of an irrigation controller (reference number 100) and a water application device (reference number 102) physically situated at a location of a user (figure 5, col. 9 line 64 - col. 10 line 42), the controller at least partially controlling the water application device (col. 10 lines 1-60), a communication system that exchanges monitoring information between the irrigation controller and a government agency wherein the communication system comprises a public, packet switched network (col. 20 lines 34-58), Collins also teaches a flow rate monitoring unit. Peek et al is relied upon to teach a controller, which is part of a network that performs irrigation control, collects various monitored data, including "flow meters...added to irrigation pipes to measure the timing and quantity of water delivered to crops..." and teaches that the monitored data is transmitted to remote locations in the network. It is still the Examiners position that the combined teachings still support a rejection under 35 USC 103(a) and that a prima facie case of obvious was properly made. Also, additional search and or consideration would be required if the patentability of the application were based upon "a communication system that sends at least one of a start time, a run time, water flow data and water pressure data from the irrigation controller to a government agency".